



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

November 2014



Cultural Resources Report

Little Deer Project

**Goosenest Ranger District, Klamath National Forest
Siskiyou County, California**

For Information Contact: Pamela Paullin
Goosenest Ranger District Archaeologist
37805 Highway 97, Macdoel, CA 96058
530-398-5742

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Analysis Indicators and Methodology	1
Spatial and Temporal Context	1
Affected Environment.....	1
Environmental Consequences	2
Alternative 1.....	3
Direct Effects and Indirect Effects.....	3
Cumulative Effects.....	3
Alternative 2 and 3.....	3
Direct Effects and Indirect Effects.....	3
Cumulative Effects.....	3
Compliance with law, regulation, policy, and the Forest Plan	3
Cultural Resources Report.....	5
Introduction.....	5
Methodology	5
Detailed Methodology	5
Analysis Indicators.....	6
Spatial and Temporal Bounding of Analysis Area	7
Affected Environment.....	7
Archeological Sites	8
Environmental Consequences	8
Alternative 1.....	9
Direct and Indirect Effects	9
Cumulative Effects.....	9
Alternative 2.....	9
Direct and Indirect Effects	9
Cumulative Effects.....	10
Alternative 3.....	10
Direct and Indirect Effects	10
Cumulative Effects.....	10
Summary of Effects	10
Compliance with law, regulation, policy, and the Forest Plan	10
Literature Cited.....	11

Executive Summary

Analysis Indicators and Methodology

Indicators for effects on historic properties within the Little Deer project area are the number of properties that are at risk from treatments proposed in the project and the degree (level) to which the integrity of historic property values in the Area of Potential Effect (APE) may be diminished by these treatments. Historic properties include archaeological sites and culturally significant areas. Archaeological and historic sites consist predominantly of the physical evidence or cultural debris left on the landscape by past societies. Culturally significant areas may be identified by the presence of physical evidence or debris, and may also consist of plant concentrations, locations for spiritual practices and sacred viewsheds. Both types of properties are identified through background research, field inspections, and tribal consultation. Additional information on these indicators is discussed in the body of the Cultural Resources report.

Approximately 68 percent of the Little Deer project area, or 3,263 acres, have been surveyed for the presence of historic properties and the findings from the completed surveys are documented in 11 survey reports. Approximately 32 percent of the Little Deer project area was not examined because the probability of finding cultural resources in the steep lava flows emanating from southwest flank of Little Deer Mountain is determined to be very low. A total of 15 recorded archaeological sites are located within the Little Deer project area. These sites consist of seven historic railroad logging camps or associated trash deposits; one depression era trash deposit; two post-WWII trash deposits; three trash deposits with cans dating from 1908 through the 1950s, one prehistoric obsidian scatter; and one obsidian workshop area. None of these sites have been evaluated for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Spatial and Temporal Context

Spatial boundaries of the analysis of effects are within the area of potential effect (APE) as defined by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800). The area of potential effect for the Little Deer project includes those areas within the Little Deer project area. This area of potential effect was chosen because this is the area that will be affected by project activities. Temporal boundaries for the short-term are based on the effects anticipated to occur during implementation or within one to five years thereafter. Dead and hazard tree removal, vegetative plantings, road maintenance and other disturbances associated with the treatment activities planned for the Little Deer project area will occur during this time frame. Long-term effects will occur after the first five years following implementation. The treatment activities associated with the Little Deer project will have concluded and disturbances from natural processes such as erosion, blow-down, and the mixing of subsurface archaeological deposits from the roots of re-establishing trees, shrubs, and forbs will become the dominant disturbance agent to archaeological sites located in the project area.

Affected Environment

The following is a broad historical overview of the human or cultural mechanisms that have influenced the project area.

Prehistory Period

Archaeological research indicates that Native Americans have occupied the Modoc Plateau for at least the last 10,000 years. Regional studies suggest exploitation of the Butte Valley and surrounding environs for a period of at least 8,000 years, primarily for hunting and gathering. Areas adjacent to permanent water sources and those where two or more ecological zones come together were highly valued. Archaeological sites, features, and artifacts from this period of time are referred to as prehistoric. One archaeological site consisting of an obsidian lithic scatter is located in the Little Deer project area. One multi-component site within the Little Deer project area contains prehistoric and historic-era artifacts.

Ethnographic Period

The project area falls within the overlapping ethnographic territories of the Shasta and the Gumbatwas band of Modoc. However, the project area is primarily within the ancestral territory of the Modoc. The Modoc people's main occupation areas were along the southern shores of Tule Lake in California and along the Lost River in Oregon. The Modoc people practiced a type of seasonal subsistence pattern that followed resources as they became available. The lands now administered by the Goosenest Ranger District were seasonally used for hunting, gathering, and procurement of obsidian for tool-making and trade. Most of the archaeological materials from this period of time are considered prehistoric, although there can be some overlap in this region with historic-era artifacts dating from the late 1700s through the 1830s.

Historic Period

The first known written report of the area comes from Peter Skene Ogden, a Hudson's Bay Company fur trapper who explored the region in 1826-1827. Euro-American settlement began in the late 1850s and early 1860s, which precipitated the Modoc War in 1872-1873. The construction of the mainline railroad from Weed, CA to Klamath Falls, OR, opened up the Goosenest Ranger District for railroad logging in the early part of the twentieth century. The largest logging operations on the District were conducted by the Long-Bell Lumber Company and its predecessor, Weed Lumber Company. Railroad logging began in the Little Deer project area in the early 1910s and continued through 1956, at which time Long-Bell pulled out of the area, removing the ties and rails. Many of the roads in the project area are converted logging railroad grades. Recreation uses such as camping and hunting became common in the Little Deer project area in the 1930s and continue to be popular activities today. Archaeological sites, features, and artifacts from this time period are referred to as historic. 14 of the 15 sites recorded in the Little Deer project area are from the historic-era time period, including an obsidian workshop area that is used as a flint-knapping demonstration location. One of the sites is multi-component and contains artifacts from the historic and prehistoric eras.

Environmental Consequences

The analysis of effects of each alternative is considered based on the proposed management actions and their potential level of impact to cultural and archaeological resources. If an action can alter in any way the characteristics that qualify the resource for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places, it is considered to have an effect. Effects are "adverse" when the alterations diminish the integrity of a property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling or association. A "no adverse effect" occurs when the project has an effect

on the resource but is not harmful to the characteristics that may qualify the resource for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Since no sites have been evaluated for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places, all sites will be treated as though they are eligible.

Alternative 1

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

There will be no direct or indirect effects to archaeological sites because no management actions will be implemented in alternative 1.

Cumulative Effects

Since there are no direct or indirect effects, there are no cumulative effects.

Alternative 2 and 3

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The treatments, as proposed under alternative 2 and 3, will have no direct or indirect effects on cultural resources because all archaeological and historic sites will be protected using standard protective measures and the project design features ARCH-1 through ARCH-5 in chapter 2 of the EA.

Cumulative Effects

Since there are no direct or indirect effects, there are no cumulative effects.

Comparison of Effects

There are no effects of any alternative on cultural resources.

Compliance with law, regulation, policy, and the Forest Plan

The three alternatives presented in this document comply with all relevant federal and state cultural resource laws and regulations including Section 106 of the NHPA, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, 36 CFR 800 (Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties), and Executive Order 13007 (Sacred Sites). The project complies with the Forest Plan, as displayed in the Forest Plan consistency checklist, available on the project website.

Federally recognized tribes were contacted early in the project planning in accordance with the Region 5 Programmatic Agreement, National Historic Preservation Act, and other laws and regulations. Other local Native American communities and/or interested parties were consulted as part of the scoping process for this project as disclosed in Chapter 1, Public Involvement. The Klamath Tribes were consulted on the identification of concerns and culturally significant areas or properties in the area of potential effect. No concerns or culturally significant areas were identified. The Forest works in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement among the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region(Region 5), California State Historic Preservation Officer, Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Processes for Compliance with Section 106 of the National

Historic Preservation Act for Management of Historic Properties by the National Forests of the Pacific Southwest Region (Regional PA) which specifies the approach for cultural resources protection, including issues such as site identification, interpretation, and protection and stabilization efforts.

Cultural Resources Report

Introduction

This report documents the analysis of effects of the proposed Little Deer Project on historic properties within the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE) based on the three alternatives that are being analyzed. Federal agencies are directed by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended) to identify historic properties, including culturally significant areas, that can be listed on or determined eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The Forest operates in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement among the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5), California State Historic Preservation Officer, Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Processes for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Management of Historic Properties by the National Forests of the Pacific Southwest Region (Regional PA) Proposed Actions and Alternatives Analyzed

Chapter 2 of the environmental assessment (EA) discusses the proposed action and alternatives for the Little Deer project.

Methodology

Detailed Methodology

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended, (NHPA) “*requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties*”. This is accomplished through a four step process following 36 CFR Part 800 Section 106 and includes:

1. Initiation of the process
2. Identification of historic properties
3. Assessment of any adverse effects
4. Resolution of adverse effects.

Region 5, including the Klamath National Forest (Forest), has entered into a Participating Agreement with the California and Nevada State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) that provides alternative procedures for complying with Section 106 of the NHPA. The Forest is required to protect sites from and/or mitigate effects to sites following Section 106 guidelines or by using the approved Standard Protection Measures (SPM) outlined in Appendix F of the Regional PA.

The potential for the proposed project activities to affect an historic property's eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) was initially assessed in the field after background research of the project area was completed. A survey report and site records were prepared to document the findings. This report presents a synthesis of the information collected during the background archival research, field inventory, and the Native American consultation phases.

Proposed actions for the Little Deer Project include dead or hazard tree removal, piling, and burning slash and tree planting all of which have the potential to affect historic properties in or

near the project area. The primary factor for determining whether project activities would have an effect on cultural resources is the level of ground disturbance near and within the boundaries of any historic properties that are present in the proposed project area. Effects of these activities will be analyzed in this report, as well as past, current, and reasonably foreseeable future actions that may affect the significance and integrity of the 15 historic properties that have been identified in the project area. These properties must be treated as eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places until a formal evaluation has been made.

As directed by a series of executive orders, federal preservation laws, and agency guidelines, field reconnaissance surveys have been completed to identify any historic properties that may be present within the project's APE. At least 11 different cultural resource field surveys have been completed on approximately 68 percent of the Little Deer project area. The remaining 32 percent of the project area includes slopes greater than 30 percent where the probability of locating cultural resources is low, including the lava flows found on the southern and southwestern flanks of Little Deer Mountain. The 15 sites inside the project area consist of seven historic railroad logging camps or associated trash deposits; one depression era trash deposit; two post-WWII trash deposits; three trash deposits with cans dating from 1908 through the 1950s, one prehistoric obsidian scatter; and one obsidian workshop area. None of these sites have been evaluated for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Analysis Indicators

Indicators for effects on historic properties within the Little Deer project area are the number of properties that are at risk from treatments proposed in the project area and the degree (level) to which the integrity of historic property values in the Area of Potential Effect (APE) may be diminished by these treatments.

An *historic property* is defined as a prehistoric or historic-era district, site, building, structure, or object, and its associated artifacts, remains, features, settings, and records that are over 50 years of age. Culturally significant areas can be identified by physical evidence such as debris and features, but also may consist of plant concentrations, locations where spiritual practices take place, and sacred viewsheds. Historic properties that have not been evaluated for *significance* and *integrity*, qualities that define a property's eligibility for listing on the NRHP, are managed as eligible properties until a formal eligibility determination is made. All historic properties are identified through background archival research, field inspections, and tribal consultation.

At risk historic properties are those properties that the Heritage Program Manager has identified as being susceptible to being adversely affected by specific undertaking activities. An *undertaking* is defined as any project, activity, or program funded in whole or in part under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of the Forest Service. An *adverse effect* occurs when an undertaking affects one or more of the seven elements of integrity of a significant historic property that contribute to its eligibility for listing on the NRHP. A property is assessed for significance using four criteria, A-D, established and defined under the NRHP. These criteria include:

- A. Association with events that have made broad contributions on a local, state or national level.
- B. Association with a person or people who have made contributions to local, state or national history.

- C. Possession of unique structural characteristics including materials, style, workmanship.
- D. The property has the potential to yield scientific or scholarly data regarding prehistoric or historic conditions.

The seven elements used to assess the *integrity* of a significant historic property include location, setting, design, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association. An *at risk* historic property is identified based on the physical characteristics of the property such as flammability or fragility, and the parameters of the undertaking including equipment weight and type, fuel loads, or fire temperature that might affect the characteristics that contribute to the eligibility of the property being listed on the NRHP.

Spatial and Temporal Bounding of Analysis Area

In order to determine the potential effects of the proposed actions on historic properties, it is first necessary to identify the area of potential effect (APE). Spatial boundaries used for the analysis of effects within the APE are defined by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations (36CFR Part 800). The APE for the Little Deer Project includes those areas within the Little Deer Fire project area. This APE was chosen because this is the area that could potentially be affected by project activities. Temporal boundaries for the short-term are based on the anticipated effects that will occur within one to five years of implementation. Dead and hazard tree removal, vegetative plantings, road maintenance and other disturbances associated with the treatment activities planned for the Little Deer project area will occur during this time frame. Long-term effects will occur between six and 50 years after implementation. The treatment activities associated with the Little Deer project will have concluded and disturbances from natural processes such as erosion, blow-down, and bioturbation or the mixing of subsurface archaeological deposits from the roots of re-establishing trees, shrubs, and forbs will become the dominant disturbance agent to archaeological sites located in the project area.

Affected Environment

The following is a broad historical overview of the human or cultural mechanisms that have influenced the project area.

Prehistory Period

Archaeological research indicates that Native Americans have occupied the Modoc Plateau for at least the last 10,000 years. Regional studies suggest exploitation of the Butte Valley and surrounding environs for a period of at least 8,000 years, primarily for hunting and gathering. Areas adjacent to permanent water sources and those where two or more ecological zones come together were highly valued. Archaeological sites, features, and artifacts from this period of time are referred to as prehistoric. One multi-component site within the Little Deer project area contains prehistoric and historic-era artifacts. *Ethnographic Period:* The project area falls within the overlapping ethnographic territories of the Shasta and the Gumbatwas band of Modoc. However, the project area is primarily within the ancestral territory of the Modoc. The Modoc people's main occupation areas were along the southern shores of Tule Lake in California and along the Lost River in Oregon. The Modoc people practiced a type of seasonal subsistence pattern that followed resources as they became available. The lands now administered by the Goosenest Ranger District were seasonally used for hunting, gathering, and procurement of obsidian for toolmaking and trade. Most of the archaeological materials from this period of time

are considered prehistoric, although there can be some overlap in this region with historic-era artifacts dating from the late 1700s through the 1830s.

Historic Period

The first known written report of the area comes from Peter Skene Ogden, a Hudson's Bay Company fur trapper who explored the region in 1826-1827. Euro-American settlement began in the late 1850s and early 1860s, which precipitated the Modoc War in 1872-1873. The construction of the mainline railroad from Weed, CA to Klamath Falls, OR, opened up the Goosenest Ranger District for railroad logging in the early part of the twentieth century. The largest logging operations on the District were conducted by the Long-Bell Lumber Company and its predecessor, Weed Lumber Company. Railroad logging commenced in the Little Deer project area in the early 1910s and continued through the through 1956, at which time the Long-Bell pulled out of the area, removing the ties and rails. Many of the roads in the project area are converted logging railroad grades. Recreation uses such as camping and hunting became popular in the 1930s and these types of activities continue today. Archaeological sites, features, and artifacts from this time period are referred to as historic. One multi-component site within the Little Deer project area contains prehistoric and historic-era artifacts.

Archeological Sites

A total of 15 recorded archaeological sites are located within the Little Deer project area. The sites inside the project area consist of seven historic railroad logging camps or associated trash deposits; one depression era trash deposit; two post-WWII trash deposits; three trash deposits with cans dating from 1908 through the 1950s, one prehistoric obsidian scatter; and one obsidian workshop area. The NHPA requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their actions on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). None of the sites in the Little Deer project area have been evaluated for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places.

Environmental Consequences

The analysis of effects of each alternative is considered based on the proposed management actions and their potential level of impact to cultural and archaeological resources. If an action can alter in any way the characteristics that qualify the resource for inclusion on the NRHP, it is considered to have an effect. Effects are "adverse" when the alterations diminish the integrity of a property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling or association. A "no adverse effect" occurs when the project has an effect on the resource but is not harmful to the characteristics that may qualify the resource for inclusion on the NHRP.

For the purposes of this analysis, the levels of impacts to these resources were defined using 36 CFR Part 800 as a guide and modified as follows:

Negligible:

The effect on cultural sites and areas would be at the lowest levels of detection – barely measurable with any perceptible consequences, either beneficial or adverse, on cultural resources. For the purposes of Section 106, the site's NRHP eligibility would not be threatened, and the determination of effect would be no adverse effect.

Minor:

The effect on cultural sites and areas would be measurable or perceptible, but it would be slight and localized within a relatively small area for a site or group of sites. The action would not affect the character or diminish the features of a NRHP eligible or listed archaeological site and would not have a permanent effect on the integrity of any cultural resource site. For the purposes of Section 106, the site's NRHP eligibility would remain intact, and the determination of effect would be no adverse effect.

A beneficial minor effect would involve the maintenance and preservation of sites. For the purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be no adverse effect.

Moderate:

The effect would be measureable and perceptible. The action would change one or more character-defining features of a cultural resource, but it would not diminish the integrity of the resource to the extent that its NRHP eligibility would be jeopardized. For purposes of Section 106, the site's NRHP eligibility would be threatened, and the determination of effect would be one of an adverse effect.

A beneficial moderate effect would involve site stabilization. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be no adverse effect.

Major:

The effect on cultural or archaeological sites would be substantial, noticeable, and permanent. For NRHP eligible or listed archaeological sites, the action would change one or more character-defining features of an archaeological resource, diminishing the integrity of the resource to the extent that it no longer would be eligible for listing on the NRHP. For the purposes of Section 106, the determination would be one of an adverse effect.

A beneficial major effect would involve active intervention to preserve and improve sites. For the purposes of Section 106, the determination would be one of no adverse effect.

Alternative 1

Direct and Indirect Effects

There will be no direct or indirect effects to archaeological sites because no management actions will be implemented in Alternative 1.

Cumulative Effects

Since there are no direct or indirect effects, there are no cumulative effects.

Alternative 2

Direct and Indirect Effects

The treatments, as proposed under Alternative 2, will have no direct or indirect effects on cultural resources. All archaeological and historic sites will be protected using standard protective measures and the project design features outlined in the project design features ARCH-1 through ARCH-5 in chapter 2 of the environmental assessment.

Cumulative Effects

Since there are no direct or indirect effects, there are no cumulative effects.

Alternative 3

Direct and Indirect Effects

The treatments, as proposed under Alternative 3, will have no direct or indirect effects on cultural resources. All archaeological and historic sites will be protected using standard protective measures and the project design features outlined in the project design features ARCH-1 through ARCH-5 in chapter 2 of the environmental assessment.

Cumulative Effects

Since there are no direct or indirect effects, there are no cumulative effects.

Summary of Effects

There will be no direct, indirect or cumulative effects to historic properties as a result of the three alternatives under consideration. Standard protection measures, including but not limited to, flagging for avoidance will be implemented to prevent adverse effects to archaeological sites located in the Little Deer project area.

Compliance with law, regulation, policy, and the Forest Plan

The three alternatives presented in this document comply with all relevant federal and state cultural resource laws and regulations including Section 106 of the NHPA, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, 36 CFR 800 (Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties), and Executive Order 13007 (Sacred Sites). The project complies with the Forest Plan, as displayed in the Forest Plan consistency checklist, available on the project website.

Federally recognized tribes were contacted early in the project planning in accordance with the Region 5 Programmatic Agreement, National Historic Preservation Act, and other laws and regulations. Other local Native American communities and/or interested parties were consulted as part of the scoping process for this project as disclosed in Chapter 1, Public Involvement. The Klamath Tribes were consulted on the identification of concerns and culturally significant areas or properties in the area of potential effect. No concerns or culturally significant areas were identified. The Forest works in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement among the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5), California State Historic Preservation Officer, Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Processes for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Management of Historic Properties by the National Forests of the Pacific Southwest Region (Regional PA) which specifies the approach for cultural resources protection, including issues such as site identification, interpretation, and protection and stabilization efforts.

Literature Cited

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region. 2013. *Programmatic Agreement Among the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5), California State Historic Preservation Officer, Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Process for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Management of Historic Properties by the Nationals Forest of the Pacific Southwest Region*. Document on file with Heritage Resources Program: Klamath National Forest Headquarters. Yreka, CA.